AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and § 1.121 Attorney Docket No.: Q67875

Application No.: 10/029,178

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the previously submitted drawings with the attached replacement sheets,

reflecting changes to Figure 3

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and § 1.121 Attorney Docket No.: Q67875

Application No.: 10/029,178

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-40 are being canceled.

Claims 41-45 are being added.

I. Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because of a misspelling in objects (13) and (19) of Figure 3. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the error and submits a replacement set of drawings with the appropriate changes to Figure 3.

II. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to informalities in claims 11, 17 and 20. As these claims have been canceled, the Applicant submits that these objections are now moot.

III. Claim Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 19 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,370,316, to Yamada.

The Applicant herein cancels claims 1-40 and adds new claims 41-45, and therefore submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are moot.

Support for the newly presented claims is found throughout the specification, but specifically from paragraphs [0203] to [0223] of the published application, US 2002/0085832 A1, and Figures 8-12.

With regard to new claims 41-45, the Applicant submits that Yamada fails to anticipate each and every element of the newly submitted claims. Yamada fails to disclose a terminal

database or storage module, such as the abstraction pattern data table 36 in Figure 7. The storage module of one embodiment, as described in claim 41, is configured to store a data table storing abstraction data correlated with certain data. Yamada does not describe a terminal database as described in the pending claims.

Further, the Applicant submits that the newly submitted claims further describe how a user can select a suitable section of the contents data from some candidate sections, which Yamada also fails to describe. The system described in the pending claims provides advancements in the quality of candidate sections by allowing for feedback of the selection in each of the terminals. The Applicant submits, for at least the reasons stated above, that Yamada fails to disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claims 41-45, as required for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The Applicant therefore believes that the newly submitted claims are allowable over Yamada.

IV. Claim Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4-18, 20-29 and 31-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable based on the combinations of Yamada in view of U.S. Patent 7,031,965, to Moriya et al.; U.S. Patent 5,835,667, to Wactlar et al.; U.S. Patent 6,988,244, to Honda et al.; U.S Patent 6,157,809, to Kambayashi; U.S. Patent 5,982,979, to Omata et al.; U.S. Patent 5,483,278, to Strubbe et al; U.S. Patent 6,775, 669, to Useaka; and U.S. Patent 7,277,621, to Kunieda et al.

As the Applicant herein cancels claims 1-40, the Applicant submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are moot.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and § 1.121 Attorney Docket No.: Q67875

Application No.: 10/029,178

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented in Section III. Above, with

regard to claims 41-45, and submits that none of the cited references provide any teaching,

suggestion or motivation for the invention embodied in the newly submitted claims. For at least

these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 41-45 are allowable over the cited references.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott H. Davison/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060 Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550
65565
CINTOMER NIDDER

Date: December 9, 2008

Scott H. Davison Registration No. 52,800

7